



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,528	02/08/2002	Eric Polesuk	P/77-2	2909

7590

10/19/2004

Philip M. Weiss
Weiss & Weiss
310 Old Country Road
Suite 201
Garden City, NY 11530-1763

EXAMINER

WILLATT, STEPHANIE L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3732

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/072,528	Applicant(s) POLESUK, ERIC	
	Examiner Stephanie L. Willatt	Art Unit 3732	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Lefebvre.

In Figures 1-4, Lee discloses a pop-up dispenser (10) for dispensing sheets of aluminum foil, as described in column 1, lines 44-48. Each sheet has a lead portion and a trailing portion. The lead portion of the first sheet (30) of aluminum foil extends through a dispensing orifice (elongated opening 14) to an elevation above that of the dispensing unit (10), as shown in Figure 3. The trailing portion of the first foil (30) overlaps the lead portion of the next hair foil to be dispensed, as discussed in column 1, lines 10-19 and column 2, lines 48-51. Withdrawing the first sheet of foil (30) pulls the next sheet, as discussed in column 1, lines 19-23. The withdrawing of the first sheet of foil (30) can be achieved with one hand. The first foil sheet (30) can be applied to a person's hair immediately after being dispensed without any further preparation if the foil sheet is already the proper size for applying to hair. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the foil

Art Unit: 3732

sheets dispensed by the dispenser of Lee the proper size for applying to hair, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ (CCPA 1955).

Lee does not disclose the application of foil to a person's hair. Lefebvre discloses the application of foil to a person's hair as prior art in column 1, lines 11-40. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the foil of Lee to a person's hair, as taught by Lefebvre, in order to highlight only selected strands of hair.

Note: According to MPEP 2111.02, the applicant has the burden of showing that the introduction of additional steps or components would materially change the characteristics of the applicant's invention if the applicant contends that additional steps or materials in the prior art are excluded by the recitation of "consisting essentially of."

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 28 June 2004 regarding Lee have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues in lines 18-21 of page 6 of the remarks that, "Lee requires and makes essential that elastic strings twist and untwist to assist the user in withdrawing the tissue or foil and then withdrawing a second sheet of tissue or foil." Examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 1, lines 37-41 of Lee, it states that "aluminum foil...might not be used with the opening formed by the plastic sheet because the weight of such a material cannot be supported by the pinching force

Art Unit: 3732

created by the plastic sheet.” Basically, it is possible to use aluminum foil without the help of the elastic strings, but it is preferable to have the elastic strings. The elastic strings are an improvement, not an essential element. Applicant's arguments with respect to Awaijane have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephanie L. Willatt whose telephone number is 703-305-6316. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin P. Shaver can be reached on 703-308-2582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Stephanie Willatt
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3732